

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE JEWISH SIBYLLINE ORACLES

WHEN speaking about the Jewish Sibylline Oracles it will not be necessary for me to enter on an examination of the origin, importance, and probable contents of the genuine Sibylline Oracles of antiquity. No doubt such an inquiry would be not only most profitable, but also highly interesting. The story goes that an unknown old woman came to King Tarquinius with nine books of divine oracles, which she offered him for sale at an enormous price. The king scornfully refused to pay the desired amount, whereupon she burnt three of the books, and demanded the same price for the remaining six. On the king again declining her offer with derision, she calmly burnt three more of the books, and desired the same sum for the three that remained. But now the king was struck by her collected and determined demeanour; he began to consider the matter more seriously, and ended by giving her the full price for the remaining three books. This tale, and others of the same nature, were handed down to posterity in evidence of the great sacredness of the Sibylline Oracles, which were preserved and concealed in the Capitol. They were only consulted on special occasions, and by direct order of the Senate, till they were burnt with the Capitol in the year of Rome, 671. A Commission was afterwards sent to several places, famous for supposed Sibylline prophecies, in order to replace, as far as possible, the lost collection. The number of Sibylline Oracles which the Commissioners found to exist was enormous, but they selected only such as were in their opinion indisputably genuine. The mass of prophetical poems continued to increase, and reached astonishing dimensions. When Augustus became Pontifex Maximus, he had all oracles that were not authenticated destroyed; the Sibylline Books were, however, spared, and occasionally consulted, till they were publicly burnt in the reign of Honorius. But the Roman oracles were not the only written oracles extant, nor is it certain that they were the oldest. The question whether the Roman oracles, in spite of the jealous anxiety with which they were kept secret, were not for all that partly or wholly known to the public; the consideration of those few fragments of genuine

ancient oracles that have come down to us, and the results to which such an inquiry must lead, are topics which I am obliged to pass by.

I have to give my attention to counterfeit fabrications, to such portions of that collection of spurious productions, which is known under the name of *Χρησμοι Σιβυλλιακοι* Sibylline Oracles, as can with the greatest probability be traced back to Jewish authors. I have to limit my inquiry to the investigation of such questions as are best calculated to give a satisfactory idea of these Jewish oracles, of the probable age of some of them, of their contents, their origin, and of the kind of criticism which has to be applied to them. Those of my readers who would wish to gain an insight into the whole collection —comprising pieces of Heathenish, Jewish and Christian origin—I refer to an article on the Sibylline Books which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, in July, 1877 (vol. cxlvi). Out of the immense mass of literature on the subject, I shall confine myself to the following few references, which can be said to be of real moment in the investigation of the Jewish oracles, to which all other inquiries on the subject written since, be they of great or small compass, always return, to discuss them, to decide between their conflicting opinions, while the new suggestions are only of trifling importance.

The modern criticism of the Oracles can be said to commence with Friedrich Bleek's treatise on their origin and composition.[1] Exhaustive in every respect are the two editions and the bulky book of dissertations of Charles Alexandre (Paris, 1841-56-59). Joseph Heinrich Friedlieb edited the Oracles in 1852, with a German metric translation, a long introduction, and critical notes. Friedlieb's translation of the third book was reprinted with introductory remarks and notes, under the title of *Alexandrinische Messiashoffnungen*, by Dr. Z. Frankel, of Breslau, in his monthly magazine in 1859. Frankel, as well as Graetz, in the third volume of his *History of the Jews*, follow on the whole Friedlieb's views. But the opinions of Alexandre and Friedlieb found a severe critic in Professor Ewald, in his essay, *Ueber Entstehung, Inhalt und Werth der Sibyllinischen Bücher*, 1858. He altogether differs from the views of Alexandre and Friedlieb, more particularly in reference to the part which is the principal subject of the

[1] Über Entstehung und Zusammenstellung der uns in acht Büchern erhaltenen Sibyllinischen Orakel, in the *Theologische Zeitschrift von Schleiermacher und De Wette*, Berlin, 1819. I doubt whether a copy of this important treatise exists in any of the large libraries in England. See *The Jewish Messiah: a Critical History of the Messianic Idea among the Jews*, etc. By James Drummond, London, 1877, page 11, note 2.

present inquiry, namely, the third book. In 1857 there appeared in Jena a little work under the title of *Die Jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlicher Entwicklung*, etc., by Dr. A. Hilgenfeld, in which the poem under consideration is subjected to a searching investigation. Hilgenfeld's and Ewald's notions on the third book are essentially the same; they only differ in some points of minor importance. It is remarkable that Ewald does not make any mention of Hilgenfeld's inquiry, although Hilgenfeld's preface is dated January, 1857, and Ewald's essay was not produced before September, 1858. And lastly, I have to mention a dissertation on the Jewish Sibylline Oracles, and a treatise on the fourth book by Dr. Benno Wilhelm Badt.[1] No subsequent inquiries have materially increased our knowledge of the Jewish Sibylline books.

After this cursory sketch of its critical literature, I return to the subject itself. I called the Oracles spurious; meaning by the word that they are not the Oracles, nor part of the Oracles of the Capitol, neither of those alleged to have been purchased by Tarquinius, nor of the later collection which was deposited there after its restoration. The authors of the older parts of our body of poems may have interwoven some ancient genuine Sibylline productions, as current in antiquity, in their works; but if so, they did it only very sparingly. The oracles which we have are without exception imitations, none of them is a remnant of the emanations from such a source as was recognised in antiquity as truly Sibyllic. This, of course, denies them all authority as real prophecies. But in the same manner we should refuse credence to the genuine ancient oracles. This, however, was not the case with the first teachers of Christianity. There can be no doubt that most of them accepted the Sibylline Oracles as authoritative, and considered them as having emanated from real prophetic inspiration. Paul, the Apostle, must perhaps be cited as the oldest among them. He is quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus as exhorting the heathens to consult the writings of the Sibyl for the belief in one God, and for the predictions of future events by her. Alexandre presumes that Clemens must have quoted some apocryphal Pauline book, although he admits that it is neither absurd nor impossible to assume that Paul should have quoted the Sibyl. The same author treats exhaustively[2] of the credit the oracles enjoyed with the

[1] *De Oraculis Sibyllinis a Judæis Compositis*, Pars I. Dissertatio Inauguralis philologica quam defendet Benno Guilelmus Badt. Breslau, 1869. Ursprung, Inhalt und Text des vierten Buches der Sibyllischen Orakel von B. Badt. Breslau, 1878.

[2] Vol. II. Excurs. IV., p. 254, *sqq.*

fathers of the Christian Church, and even with later Christian writers. People continued in the Middle Ages to imitate the oracles, and to prophesy without scruple on comparatively modern historical events. Great Britain has in this way been particularly taken notice of by Sibyls of that class, whose productions were then ascribed to some renowned author quite after the classical style of literary forgery. Thus, an oracle which was most probably composed by some German or Italian towards the end of the twelfth century, was fathered on the venerable Bede, who lived at the beginning of the eighth century. Bladud, Hudibras, and the hero of so many fables, Cadwalldr, the last king of the Britons, had special attention paid to them by some such Sibyl. Of the latter it is particularly related that he consulted, among other prophecies, also those of the Sibyl. Nay, a meddlesome prophet had something to say even about the Wars of the Roses, and himself took the side of the Yorkists.[1]

Such fabrications, however unimportant in themselves, show of what lasting influence the impulse was, as given by those Sibylline authors of old. The belief in their authority was shared by many well informed writers even of later ages. I shall give two examples of English authors who tenaciously clung to that belief. The first whom I think it worth while to mention, because I have not found his name alluded to in this connection by any author on the subject, is Roger Bacon.[2] He implicitly believed in the prophetic power of the Sibyls, relying on the authority of Augustine and Isidore, and "all the saints." He is quite sure that they promulgated Divine oracles, and concludes *a fortiori* that if such frail women were thus inspired, how much more was this possible for philosophers. The second example is important as a specimen of learned men of a much later period, who attached credence to the Oracles even after the belief in their genuineness had already been seriously shaken. William Whiston edited, in 1715, a *Vindication of the Sibylline Oracles, to which are added the genuine Sibylline Oracles themselves, etc.* In this work Whiston admits that most of the Sibylline Books are fictitious; but some of them, namely, those which he reprints, he holds to be not only remnants of the ancient oracles, but also to contain really Divine revelation. He says,[3] "It is not reasonable for this age to recede from the ancient opinion in this matter, without any new and good evidence to the contrary; but they ought still to allow the Sibylline Oracles

[1] Alexandre, Vol. II., p. 298.

[2] *Opus majus*, II., cap. viii., p. 39, compare p. 169. *Opus Tertium*, pp. 79 and 81.

[3] P. 82.

to have been Divinely inspired. It appears, therefore, that though God gave positive laws, or an institution of religious worship only to the Jews, and intrusted them only with those Divine oracles that related to the same, yet that he did not wholly confine Divine inspiration to that nation; but supported the law and religion of nature, and the right worship of himself as the one and true God, among the heathens also, all along by these oracles till the light of the Christian revelation was spread over the world."

It is needless to state that no Jewish author ever attached any importance to these oracles. Josephus,[1] in speaking of the tower of Babel, cites the words from the third Book, which I shall have to discuss afterwards. He says, "the Sibyl also" mentions the tower. That he drew from a heathen source, but not from the poem itself is clear, for the "God" of the poem is, in his quotation, "the Gods." That Philo ever mentioned them is doubtful. In the works of his which we possess no mention of them is made.[2]

After these preliminary remarks, I proceed to consider that part of the collection, of which two things are certain: first, that it is the most ancient of all these oracles; and, secondly, that it was composed by a Jew. There is some difference of opinion as to the constituent parts of the whole poem. Two fragments, namely, have been preserved by Theophilus of Antioch in his Book to Autolycus, under the name of "the Sibyl." According to Hilgenfeld, Ewald and others, they are a part of the same poem as the greater portion of the third Book. But, according to Alexandre, they exhibit proofs of having been composed, not by a Jewish, but by a Christian author. I shall cite a few verses from the first fragment, in order to give a specimen of its contents, and also to illustrate, by means of them, some of the arguments brought forward by Alexandre for assigning them to a Christian author. The fragment commences: "O mortal men, made of flesh, mere nothings, how are you so full of self-importance, not considering that your life must end? Neither do you tremble at, nor fear God, who governs you; the supreme Lord, who knows, sees, and is aware of all things; who is the Creator who preserves all, who sent his sweet spirit into every one, and made it the governor of all men. There is one God, the only God. He is very great, unbegotten, omnipotent, invisible. He sees everything, but cannot be seen by any mortal. For what flesh can behold with his eyes the celestial, true, and immortal Being, who lives in Heaven, since men,

[1] *Antiq.*, I. iv. 3.

[2] See Friedlieb's Introduction, p. 9.

who are born mortals, made of bones, veins, and flesh, cannot even bear to look at the beams of the sun. Worship him, the only God, the governor of the world, who alone exists from everlasting to everlasting. He exists from himself, is unbegotten. He governs all things at all times."

It is evident that in these verses, as translated here, there is nothing that could not have been written by a Jew; nay, the whole tenor of the piece points to a Jew as its author. Alexandre, however, sees in the words: "Who sent his sweet spirit into every one, and made it the governor of all men," a sign that it must have been composed by a Christian. He prints the word *Πνεῦμα*, Spirit, with a capital letter; and asserts that what is called here the sweet Spirit is nothing else but the λόγος, the "Word" of the New Testament, and is equivalent to the Son. He maintains that the expressions used are taken from the first chapter of John, but that the author of our fragment confused the Spirit with the Word or the Son; and adds, that it was an error, common in the first ages of the Church, to confuse these two persons. "Verum, hanc duarum personarum, saltem sermone tenus, confusionem primis ecclesiæ temporibus vulgatam fuisse, certum est." And he considers the words, "Who sent his sweet Spirit into every one, and made it the governor of all men," only a reproduction of the sentence in John i. 9: "That was the light which lighteth every man that comes into the world." Gfrörer[1] proves from Philo's writings that the word *πνεῦμα* was well known to Hellenistic Jewish authors, and is equivalent to *νοῦς*, Intellect. This is true enough. But really we need not confine ourselves to this technical meaning of the word *πνεῦμα* in order to understand this passage. Our author did nothing but reproduce the words of Genesis, "And he breathed in his nostrils the breath of life, or the spirit of life," taking them in the same sense as they are understood by many Jewish commentators, among others by Nachmanides and Mendelssohn.

Alexandre finds also evidences of a Christian authorship in the following expressions (ver. 23): "You walk in pride and madness, leaving the straight way; you wander through rocky and thorny paths. O vain men! Cease to wander in darkness, in a black and obscure night. Leave the darkness of the night and enter into light. Behold, he is manifest to all, and does not deceive. Come, and do not pursue this thick darkness; behold the pleasant light of the sun shining gloriously." Alexandre avers that the light mentioned here cannot mean

[1] *Philo und die Alexandrinische Theosophie*, II., p. 124.

anything else but the light of Christianity. Well, to the unprejudiced mind it is obvious that "he" in this passage refers to God. The poet admonishes the Gentiles to forsake their dark superstitions for the light of truth, and to turn to God, whose light shines bright and is a guide to all men.

Besides these large fragments, there are two small ones, one of which was preserved by Lactantius, and the other by Theophilus. Both belong most probably to our section. The one of them argues: "If it were true that gods were born to continue alive and to be immortal, there would be in the end more gods than human beings, and no standing-room would be left for the mortals." A heathen, if he were only orthodox enough or frivolous enough, could easily have met this argument. We know, namely, the myth according to which Saturn devoured some of his children. We see, therefore, that the notion of immortality does not exclude the possibility of being eaten when young. This expedient could thus be resorted to by the older and more hungry gods, whenever such an over-population of gods should threaten to become in the least troublesome. This would not be a survival of the fittest, but of those endowed with the best appetites. However, to speak seriously, the objection must certainly have sounded most awkwardly on the ears of a faithful pagan of those days. Now it is true that a Christian could have made use of such words on other occasions. Yet he would hardly have employed them in an address to the heathens, and thus have provided his opponents with a cue for retorting on him.[1] Nor would a Christian have said to them, that he is a God who cannot be seen by any mortal. He would not have called him invisible, unbegotten, nor would he have used the expression which we find in the second large fragment,[2] that a God cannot possibly be created from the loins of man or woman. All these expressions show to demonstration that the author of these fragments was a Jew. The fact that in the second fragment the folly is shown of worshipping serpents, dogs, cats and birds, and images of stone, or heaps of stone, shows clearly that the author lived in Egypt, where such forms of idolatry were most rampant.

These fragments were, according to Ewald and others, part and parcel of that celebrated Sibylline Oracle which commences with the 97th verse of the third Book. It is, as said before, the most ancient portion of the whole collection, and is unmistakeably of Jewish origin. The two large fragments were quoted by Theophilus as belonging to "the Sibyl."

[1] See Badt, p. 17. [2] v. 40, Alexandre—Zweites Fragm., 1, 2 Friedlieb.

Besides these two pieces, Theophilus also cites two other short passages, one of which we find in the third Book. Now Theophilus speaks all along only of one Sibyl; all the verses quoted by him must therefore have occurred in the same piece. Lactantius mentions part of the procœmium (this is the title our fragments bear in the editions), as belonging to the Erythræan Sibyl, but he quotes also another passage, which we find in the third Book. We know that he ascribed the body of our poem to the Erythræan Sibyl. It is evident that the fragments and the bulk of the third Book were to him also one whole poem. We may, therefore, unhesitatingly assume that the poem, as continued in the greater part of the third Book, commenced with the address to the Gentiles, preserved by Theophilus.

Between this latter fragment and its continuation, as we find it in Book iii., v. 97, there must have been some verses which are lost. According to Ewald, a rather large passage is missing. Let us read the last words of the procœmium and its continuation in the third Book, and then consider what it was that may have filled up the existing gap. The end of the fragment is: "To him who has the power of life, and of incorruptible and eternal light, and who can give to men joys exceeding all the sweetness of honey, to him alone bend the neck, and follow the way of eternal righteousness. But you have forsaken all these; you have drunk a cupful of the unmixed wine of God's vengeance, which is very strong and thick, by your madness and folly. Neither are you willing to become sober and sound in your minds to know the true God and King, whose providence is over all things. Wherefore the burning of a fervent fire shall seize on you, and you shall burn in flames continually for ever; and be ashamed of your unprofitable false images But they who worship the true and eternal God shall inherit life. They shall inhabit the flourishing garden of Paradise and there feast on the sweet bread which comes from the starry skies." Thus the fragment ends, and Book iii., v. 97, proceeds:—"But when the threats of the great God are accomplished, with which he once threatened the men who built the tower in the country of Assyria, all spoke the same speech, and they wished to ascend to the starry heavens. Then the immortal God sent violent storms, and when the wind had overthrown the great tower which excited mutual contention among them, therefore men gave to that city the name of Babylon."

Ewald contends that the Sibyl was obliged, after the powerful exhortation to the heathens, to enter on a narrative about

the creation of the world and of mankind. She probably also mentioned the Flood. Then she went on to speak of the wickedness of the human race, which grew constantly, and (thus the Sibyl prophesied) will go on growing till the time of the Messiah. This led her to mention the threat of the Messianic judgment, and to foretell a subsequent completion of the empire of that nation, which now already was the bearer of the true religion. And at this point she continues: "But when the threats of the great God will be accomplished, which were once threatened to men, who built the tower in the country of Assyria."

No doubt, a passage exhibiting this flow of ideas, in the regularity of their sequence as suggested by Ewald, would be splendid indeed, if only we possessed it. But it is lost, if ever it did exist. It is true that there is nothing in Theophilus' fragments that could be called threatenings; therefore something about threats must have preceded the opening verses. But it is doubtful whether we must assume the loss of such an elaborate composition as Ewald speaks of. And what does Ewald mean, when he says that the Sibyl prophesies the triumph of that religion which *already now* flourishes in some nation of the earth? Now already! When? At what time must we imagine the Sibyl to utter her prophecies?

In my opinion some verses may have become lost between the so-called proœmium and verse 97 of the third Book. The poem was certainly rather roughly handled by the compiler of the Sibylline books and before his time. A portion of it was not taken up in the collection. The poem was lacerated, a piece thrust out, the best part of it tacked on to the first ninety-six verses of the third book, to which it does not belong. Thus, the only thing to be surprised at is that so much of it has been saved. Nevertheless it does not seem to me that the poem as a whole suffered so much as Ewald supposes.

To prove this I must stop for a moment to consider the question already touched upon before, about the time at which the pretended Sibyl wishes us to believe that she produced her vaticinations. Now it has been observed by more than one critic that our Sibyl plays her part remarkably well. She rarely forgets herself. She meets all questions that could arise as to her genuineness by her diction, by her tone, by the figures she employs, and by the direct information she imparts. One of the objections to be anticipated from some sceptic or other would be what is her origin, and how is it that a Sibyl, whose sole object is the glorification of the

Jewish nation, of its religious tenets and its Messianic hopes, should try to attain her object by speaking Greek to Greeks.

Sensible of this incongruity, she obviates beforehand any such objection by concluding her prophecies with the following words (verses 808-811):—"These things I prophesied concerning God's wrath upon men, when I was inspired with madness, and left the high walls of Babylon in Assyria, sent as a fire to Greece, to prophesy to men these divine enigmas." These words I consider to be the conclusion of the whole poem. By Babylon she means the Babylon of old. She professes to have been sent from Babylon to disclose the future to the Greeks. She pretends to have lived at the time when all people still spoke the same speech, that she witnessed the dispersion of the human race, on which occasion she herself left Babylon for Greece, sent to its inhabitants to lift the veil which conceals the future. She was called by some the Hebrew Sibyl, because of the contents of her prophecies, which only tend to the exaltation of the Hebrew race. But on account of the information she gives here of herself some called her the Babylonian, others the Chaldæan Sibyl. And now the reason is obvious why she commences her predictions with the history of the tower of Babel. If this explanation is correct, the gap between the introductory address to the Gentiles, and the historical part cannot be very considerable.

I do not ignore the difficulties of this explanation. I must assume that all the seventeen verses after verse 811 are later additions. It is true Bleek also rejected them, but he also rejects the passage which I consider as the conclusion of the whole poem. Others believe that only the last eleven verses are fictitious. Ewald, however, defends the whole passage, which runs as follows:—"These things I prophesy concerning God's wrath upon mortal men, when I was mad and left the high walls of Babylon in Assyria, sent as a fire to Greece, to prophesy to men these divine enigmas. And the people of Hellas say that I am from another country, from Erythræ, and call me shameless. Others call me the mad, the lying Sibyl, the daughter of Circe and Gnostos. But when all shall be fulfilled, then you will remember me, and nobody would call me, the prophetess of the great God, mad. He disclosed to me the past about my parents as well as generally, and God sent me to speak to mortals of the past and of the future. For when the world was deluged by the waters, only one good man was left in a house made of wood floating on the waters, with animals and birds, that the world might be filled again. Then I was his daughter-in-law, and of his blood. To him

the former things were shown and the last; therefore everything said by me is true."

Ewald's words in explanation of this passage, which he assumes to be genuine, are as follows: "The poet desired, above all, to invent a suitable Sibyl, who could speak his words for him as they flowed from his heart. According to the vv. 812-815, he found two Sibyls of fame and authority among the Greeks; namely, the Erythræan, whose fame was of long standing, and another in Italy, whom, it is true, he does not call the Cumæan, but who is sufficiently designated as belonging to Italy, by being called by him the daughter of Circe and Gnostos. He was evidently very well acquainted with the verses that were current under the names of such Sibyls, and he was obliged to follow their manner. But the Sibyl who speaks for him must stand high above these; and this must be the case even if the Erythræan Sibyl had not already been called shameless by the Greeks, and the Italian one lying, as the poet thinks was done in his days."

Now, it must be admitted, that if all these verses are genuine, we must assume that a large portion of the beginning of the historical part of our poem has disappeared. For although the first event mentioned in the Bible after the history of the deluge is the dispersion of men at the building of the tower, yet the Sibyl says that it was also her vocation to speak of things past. But I cannot acquiesce in Ewald's theory about the genuineness of that passage in which she calls herself Noah's daughter. Even that part of the epilogue in which she deprecates being confounded with the Erythræan Sibyl, or with the daughter of Circe and Gnostos, is more than suspicious. Not to speak of Bleek's objections, which Badt considers to have been fully met by Hilgenfeld, I ask, how can we possibly believe that the author of v. 809 could immediately afterwards have written vv. 815-817? She says of herself, "When I was mad, *οἰστρομανής*." It seems here to be taken as a highly respectable attribute for a Sibyl. But a few verses after she says, "Many call me mad, *μαινομένη*, but in time it will be recognised that I am not mad." Here mad is evidently taken in a bad sense, and uttered in one breath with *ψευστείρα*, lying. If being *οἰστρομανής*, (furious, mad, a maniac) is such a great recommendation in one respectable Sibyl, why should it be a blame in others? Or, on the other hand, if it is a disgrace for a Sibyl to be a maniac, why should she profess herself to be such? For the word *οἰστρομανής* just as the more classical *οἰστροπλήξ*, literally, "stung by the gadfly," and *μαινόμενος*, mean the same thing, "mad." Therefore I maintain that the author of

808-811 was not the same as the one who wrote the subsequent passage.

The motive for making the addition was this. The author of our poem, who certainly followed the pattern of the older Sibylline poems, imitated some of the verses which were known as belonging to the Erythræan and to the Cumæan Sibyl. Our piece, when it was first produced, was called a Sibylline oracle. Some, as is evident from the passage in question, called it an oracle of the Erythræan, others of the Cumæan Sibyl; according to the esteem in which they held either prophetess. But in the confusion of Greek and Oriental legends, there were some who invented a Hebrew or Jewish Sibyl, according to the tenor of the poem; some assumed a Babylonian or Chaldæan Sibyl, from the information she gives of herself. These fables were further spun out, and the Queen of Saba, whom some called Nicaula,[1] was credited with Sibylline qualities. This led some to call the Sibyl right out Saba, which again was altered into Sambethæ.[2] But some one, probably a Christian, in the early times of Christianity, must have been shocked by the fact that such holy things, which he fully believed to be real predictions, should be ascribed to heathenish false prophetesses. He, therefore, in vindication of his prophetess, who professed to be of Babylon, added these verses: "May they call her the Erythræan, or the Cumæan, and not the Babylonian Sibyl; there will be a time that they will acknowledge her as the prophetess of the great God." He dismissed both Sibyls with a compliment or two. The Erythræan he calls shameless, the other a lying maniac, quite forgetting, in his zeal, that being a maniac is a quality of which a true Sibyl ought to be proud, and which his own client ascribed to herself.

That the last part, in which she calls herself a daughter-in-law of Noah, is spurious, is evident simply from the fact that Noah is said to have been the only man (τις ἀνὴρ μόνος) who was saved with animals and birds. The whole passage is very corrupt. Ewald tries to doctor it by alterations of the text and explanations. But certainly ἀνὴρ μόνος means only one man; and this is in contradiction with the narrative of Genesis where there are four. Such a blunder could have been made by one of the authors of some of the other books, who sometimes betray a merely superficial

[1] Thus ספר יוחסין ניקולאה(ו) (ed. Filipowski, עקואלה), most probably from Josephus, *Antiq.* VIII. vi. 2.

[2] See Alexandre, II., p. 82, *sqq.*

acquaintance with the Pentateuch; but not by the author of the third Book, who displays all through an intimate knowledge of the Bible.

That the poet ascribes the destruction of the tower to the winds presents no difficulty. It is an essentially Jewish tradition: it is found in the Ritual of the German Jews, and in some other Jewish books.[1]

Our poet next gives a narrative of the fight of the Titans. He says that, ten generations after the Flood, Kronos, Titan and Iapetos reigned on earth. They were the sons of Ouranos and Gaia, of Heaven and Earth. This couple received these names because they were so extremely good. The sons ought to have reigned each over a third part of the earth; but when their father died the sons fought for the supremacy. The struggle was particularly fierce between Kronos, and Titan; but by the interference of Rhea, Gæa, Aphrodite, Demeter and Dione, a compact was entered into between Kronos and Titan, that Kronos should have the sovereignty for life, but that it should devolve on Titan after his demise. To prevent the kingship being withheld from Titan by Kronos' sons, the following measure was adopted: The Titans were watchful whenever Rhea gave birth to a child. Twice already they had destroyed Kronos' male issue; but the third time Rhea was delivered of twins, Hera and Zeus. Hera was born first. When the Titans saw that a girl was born they went away satisfied, and Rhea contrived to save Zeus. She also managed to save Poseidon and Pluto. When the Titans saw that they had been deceived, Titan came with sixty sons and kept Kronos and Rhea in prison. But the latter's sons waged war with the Titans, and this was the first of all wars.

The general opinion is that here the author closely followed the narrative of the fight of the Titans, as found in Hesiod's *Theogony*, with the exception of such alterations as were demanded by the monotheistic view of the author. He, therefore, changed Hesiod's gods into human beings, made them dwell on earth, and remoulded the myth so as to make it appear to be a piece of ancient history.

I myself do not think that our author took all this trouble. I am of opinion that he found these alterations ready to hand. Hilgenfeld says that he explained the myth after the Euhemeristic fashion; but I am convinced that all he did was to put the very words of Euhemeros into verse.

[1] In a piece recited on the Day of Atonement, beginning אמיץ כח; and in the בעל המורים s. v. ויתדלו. Evidently it was an old Midrash.

There lived about the year 300 before the Christian era, a man called Euhemeros, most probably a native of Messana, in Sicily, who, induced by his protector, King Cassander of Macedonia, composed one of the most curious books that ever were written. He called it ἱερὰ ἀναγραφή—Sacred History. In this book he started the theory that the gods were in reality human beings, who had been deified after their death. The geography, topography and archæology, which he required to prove his propositions, he invented himself. He declared that on his travels he had read of the most important actions of Uranus, Kronos and Zeus, in an inscription on a golden column in the Temple of Zeus Triphylios, on the island of Panchæa, in the Southern Ocean. Now this island was not situated in the Southern Ocean; the only place of its existence was in the fertile brains of Euhemeros. This Sacred History is lost; but the quotations from this book, as given by some authors, together with the fragments of the Latin translation by the poet Ennius, sufficiently prove that Euhemeros' account of the strife with the Titans is essentially the same as that given by the Sibyllist. His very expressions often correspond to the letter with those in the Sibylline account. Uranus was, according to Euhemeros, a mighty king, who owed his name to his great knowledge of astronomy. It would only be repeating the Sibyl to give his version of the Titanic quarrels. Euhemeros was called a wicked atheist by his contemporaries and by some later authors. In the present age of comparative mythology his method is called shallow, unpoetical, and unscientific. But, however easy it may be to sneer at his system, it was, nevertheless, a mighty effort in his days, and produced great consequences.

When we consider the eagerness with which new theories are taken hold of by some people, who are dazzled by their novelty and their plausibility, we must not be surprised that the learned Jews of Alexandria, having become acquainted with the imposing mass of Greek myths, were only too glad to find a system ready at hand by means of which they could reconcile them with their own monotheistic notions. I do not doubt but that they really believed the myths to be ancient history, which had been corrupted by the stupid, idol-ridden crowd. To them Euhemeros must have appeared in the light of a beneficent sage, and his system as the acme of wisdom. That his whole theory has been exploded is a fate that has been, and will be, met with by many systems which in their day were worshipped as oracles.

After the narrative of the Titanic war, our Sibyl begins to

prophesy in good earnest. She narrates how the word of the great God flew into her heart, and bade her prophesy to all mankind. The house of Solomon will reign over the horsemen of Phœnicia and Macedonia and the isles. A second nation will be the Hellenic-Macedonian power, and then the Romans will rule over many countries and terrify all kings. Their avarice and greed will cause much misery to mankind until the reign of the *seventh* king of Hellenic origin over Egypt. Then the people of God will be strong again, and be the guides of life to mortals.

Here we have reached one of the moot points at issue between Alexandre and Ewald. If we reckon from Alexander the Great as the first king, the seventh will be Ptolemæus VI., Philometor. He was taken prisoner by Antiochus Epiphanes in 170, and died in 146. Now, if we assume with Alexandre that by "the seventh king" Philometor was meant, then our oracle must have been composed before 170, for after that time Philometor was neither the sole nor the undisputed possessor of the throne. In that case a large portion of the third Book (vv. 295-488) cannot belong to our Sibyllist, because it contains allusions to events after Philometor's time. Alexandre, therefore, assigns that piece to a much later period. But if we assume, with Ewald and others, that the seventh king is Ptolemæus Physcon, then all those allusions may refer to contemporary facts, and the piece in question would be an integral part of our oracle, and the whole written during the latter years of Physcon, when he wielded undisputed power. When comparing the arguments of Ewald and of Alexandre, it appears that Ewald, and before him Hilgenfeld, have proved their propositions, and the piece relegated by Alexandre to a later time has to be considered as a portion of our poem. It is curious that the author of the article in the *Edinburgh Review*, who follows Ewald's guidance all along, agrees on this point with Alexandre. He says that it seems quite impossible that a pretending prophet, writing at any period subsequent to the successful rising under Judas Maccabæus, or at least to the death of Simon in the year 156, could have given utterance, in the form of a prediction, to the high hopes which are embodied in these verses.

But, first of all, Simon did not die in 156, but in 135; and, secondly, why could not such hopes be fostered by a poet living at the time of John Hyrcanus? But granted even that the poem dates from the early years of Simon, even in that case our author could have lived in the days of Physcon, for when Simon became High Priest, Philometor had been dead already for three years.

The Sibyl, speaking of the Jews, prophesies that misfortune will befall the pious men, who live about the temple of Solomon, who have their origin from Ur of the Chaldees. They do not turn themselves to the circuit of the sun, or of the moon, nor to monstrous phenomena on earth, nor to sorcerers, nor charmers, nor ventriloquism, nor Chaldæan astrology, nor to the stars. They practise justice and virtue without greed for money. They have just weights and measures. They do not rob each other, nor remove the landmarks of their neighbours. The rich does not grieve the poor nor oppress the widow, but rather assists them, giving them part of the harvest, in obedience to the sacred law of God. A description follows of their miraculous wanderings through the desert under Moses' leadership. God gave the law from Heaven, which they must faithfully observe. But they would have to leave their splendid temple and their country. Every land, every sea, will be full of them, but their own land will be empty of them. Their fortified hill, the temple of the great God, and the high walls, all will be cast to the earth, because of their sins and idolatry. They will be slighted by everyone for their customs. But happiness and great honour would return after seventy years of hardship. There is a royal clan whose family will not go down. It will reign in the course of time, and commence to build the temple of God. The poet alludes here to Zerubbabel, who was of the house of David. The kings of Persia, he continues, will assist. God himself will give a holy dream in the night, and then the temple will be again as it was before. Our pretended Sibyl maintains her assumed part by feigning to be exhausted. She prays to God to relieve her, but God again orders her to prophesy to the whole earth.

She first addresses Babylon, foretelling her utter ruin and destruction for having overthrown the temple. This passage is most poetical; in it, however, the Sibyl, in her ecstasies, seems to forget for once the part she plays, and shows her true colours in verses 312, 313: "And thou shalt be filled with blood, as thou hast *formerly* spilt the blood of good and righteous men, which *even now* cries to Heaven." So difficult it is, even for ever so dexterous an imitator, to keep up a *rôle* throughout a work of about a thousand lines.

The next vaticination is about Egypt (314-318), in which again the seventh generation of kings is mentioned. Thereupon follow predictions about Gog and Magog, and the Libyans, and about the miseries of a great many cities. Passages, like the one that follows next, describing the great power and predicting the ultimate fall of Rome, chiefly in-

duced many learned men to consider a great part of the poem as having been written at a later date. Rome, they argue, had not risen yet to that power at the time of the poet of the other parts; neither could he have known of any reverses the Romans had sustained, nor of the full prosperity of that nation. But if the poem was composed in the later days of Ptolemæus Physcon, after the fall of Corinth and Carthage, the poet could have justly described Rome as risen from earth to heaven. That he alludes to the ultimate fall of the virgin, the daughter of Rome, as he calls her—in imitation of the Biblical "virgin, daughter of Zion"—has its ground in the conviction of the Jewish author, that it was to be a king from the holy land who would dictate in the end to the nations of the earth.

After this follow the remarkable words:—

Ἔσται καὶ Σάμος ἄμμος, ἐσεῖται Δῆλος ἄδηλος καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη,

"Samos will become a heap of sand (ammos), Delos will disappear (adelos), Rome will be a village (rume)." I abstain, in going through the contents of our poem, from pointing out the places in Holy Writ to which the author refers; but I must make an exception in this case. First, because I am not aware that it has been pointed out before that this play upon words is an imitation of Zephaniah ii. 4. There we find a prophecy about Gaza, Ashkelon, Ashdod, and Ekron: "For Gaza shall be forsaken and Ashkelon a desolate place; they shall drive Ashdod out at noon, and Ekron shall be uprooted." About the first and the last cities the Hebrew text reads כי עזה עזובה תהיה ועקרון תעקר. The prophet is rather utilising the similarity of sound in עזה עזובה and עקרון תעקר than playing upon the words; the expressions are placed at the beginning and end of the sentence, and thus avoid offending good taste. In imitation of this our Sibyllist brings in his predictions about Samos, Delos, and Rome, in three consecutive puns.

And, secondly, if my surmise about an imitation of Zephaniah is correct, it would settle another point which is not without importance. For if the poet observed the play upon words in Zephaniah he must have read the Bible in Hebrew, for it is lost and quite unnoticeable in any translation. This circumstance would at once raise our author above a large crowd of other Sibyllists and of Jewish Hellenistic writers—not, perhaps, excepting even Philo—whose knowledge of the Bible was only acquired from translations, because they were ignorant of the Hebrew tongue.

The author proceeds to depict the Messianic period. But that time will not come soon, other events will precede it. He alludes to Alexander of Macedon as a pretended descendant

of Jupiter, but in reality, he says, he is the offspring of slaves. He mentions the conquest of Macedon by the Romans; and consequently cannot have written before 146. He pays special attention to the fate of the Seleucides in an obscure passage, which has been satisfactorily explained by Hilgenfeld and Ewald, as referring to Antiochus Epiphanes, Alexander Balas, and Tryphon. The poet speaks of Troy, and calls Homer a lying writer, who certainly has much wit and eloquence, but borrowed from her, the Sibyl. After many predictions about Rome and various other heathen countries, the Sibyl was again exhausted, but God commanded her again to speak. This part is chiefly devoted to the glorification of the Jewish nation, the holy stock of righteous men, who will observe the counsels of the supreme God, and will honour his temple by offerings. They do not serve idols, but every morning, when they rise from their beds, they consecrate their hands with water before honouring God, and above all they will be mindful of holy wedlock. And after a description of the misfortunes and disturbances in nature, which will precede that happy consummation, the Sibyl concludes with the words which I have discussed already, and which form, in my opinion, the natural conclusion of the whole poem.

Having thus given an outline of the contents of the greater part of the third Book, I shall only add a few words about the other oracles which are presumably of Jewish origin. The first 96 verses were in my opinion not written by a Jew. A Jewish authorship can only be assumed by the most forced arguments, by a disputable explanation of the words ἐκ Σεβαστηνῶν, by assuming that the name Beliar (Belial), as a proper noun and applied to a kind of enemy of man, of an Anti-Christ, was a Jewish conception,[1] and the like.

The fourth Book is most probably the work of a Jew, nor is there any ground to assume with Hilgenfeld, Ewald, and Delaunay,[2] that it was written by an Essene. When he speaks in depreciating words of a temple, he means, as is evident from the context, heathen temples. When he says: "Happy will be those men who will love the great God, praying before eating and drinking," he alludes to an absolutely Jewish rite, not one, which according to Ewald, points to an Essene. Nor is it a proof of either Christian or Essene authorship when

[1] Neither for the use of that word as a proper noun, nor for the whole conception, does any foundation exist in Jewish writings. Ewald's remark (p. 56), that there exists no Antichrist against the more lifeless Jewish Messiah, is very striking.

[2] Moines et Sibylles dans l'antiquité Judeo-Grecque. Paris, 1874. This author scents Essenism everywhere.

he says: "They abrogate all temples and altars, the seats of dumb stones, soiled with the blood of animals"; for here again he speaks only of idol worship. They are soiled by the blood of offerings, but the same thing in the temple of the Jews, which was already destroyed, would tend to the glory of God. And thus he adds immediately (line 30) *βλέψουσι δ' ἑνὸς θεοῦ εἰς μέγα κύδος*. There is nothing strange in the fact of a man blaming in one case the very thing which, under other circumstances, he would praise. He is not indifferent to the destruction of the temple, which he calls the temple of God. And when he summons the Heathens to repent, to turn to God, and "to bathe their whole body in rivers," he simply alludes to the bath which Jewish law demands of every proselyte. "They do not murder, nor steal, nor covet another man's wife, nor do they commit unnatural vices. Other people do not imitate such piety and such manners, but sneer and laugh at them in their folly, and impute to them their evil doings. For the whole human race is incredulous, *δύσπιστον*." Thus at least the passage is usually translated. But I think *δύσπιστον* is to be taken in the less classical, passive meaning of untrustworthy, lying, in which sense the word is used by some later authors, and that the sentence is a reproduction of Psalm cxvi. 11, "all men are lying." The complaint about being laughed and sneered at, and having the evil doings of others imputed to them, is really quite in keeping with experiences of the Jews of all ages, and must certainly have emanated from a Jewish source.

The fifth Book was also undoubtedly composed by a Jew. It breathes the most unbounded patriotism, and has peculiar beauties of its own. All alleged traces of a Christian authorship of this book vanish one by one on closer inspection. And that passage which was thought to be the clearest evidence of the author's Christian persuasion, is nothing but the hope of a reappearance of Moses. The words are: "But an excellent man will again come from Heaven, the best of the Hebrews, whose hands approached the fruitful stick, who once stayed the sun, and spoke with beautiful speech and holy lips." The "fruitful wood" was explained as alluding to the cross. Ewald, however,[1] understands the words as expressing the hope of a reappearance of Moses; but he gives no explanation. Badt gives only a confused explanation, because, like all commentators, he finds that mention is here made of Joshua, *ὃς ἠλίον ποτε στῆσε*, who caused the sun to stand still. Who else can be meant here if not Joshua? The fact is that no

[1] P. 56, note 5.

mention whatever is made here of Joshua. But who else caused the sun to stand still, if not Joshua? Well, Moses himself, according to a very old Jewish tradition to be found in Midrash Tanchumah, and thence also in Rashi, to Exodus xvii. 18: "His hands were steady until the going down of the sun. The Amalekites had calculated the hours by means of their astrology. But Moses caused sun and moon to stand still, and confused their hours, and it is this to which the prophet Habakkuk alludes,[1] when he says:—He (Moses understood) lifted up his hands on high. The sun and moon stood still." The Sibyllist thus speaks only of Moses, who by lifting his staff stayed the sun and thus defeated the Amalekites, all perfectly in accordance with ancient Jewish traditions. The whole book would deserve a more minute analysis, but space does not allow it.

After all, on considering the Jewish Sibylline oracles, the chief interest centres in the poem of which I have given a fuller description, namely the third Book. The whole is pervaded with a spirit of the purest monotheism. The author's love for his country and his race, his unshaken attachment to Jerusalem, his profound veneration of the law of God, are evident in almost every line. The ultimate greatness of the Jewish nation, the glorious restoration of Jerusalem, and the acknowledgment by the whole world of the religious doctrines of the Jews are to him not matters of faith, but certainty. His diction abounds with expressions taken from the Hebrew prophets, in whose works, it is plain, he was well read. Gfrörer has proved that his philosophical and ethical views are those of the learned Alexandrian Jews of his age. As a poem, his work may rank among the best productions of all ages. A special affection for Hellas is apparent; the author evidently endeavours to amalgamate the myths, the wisdom, and the poetry of Greece, with the history and lore of Israel. But, as Ewald truly says, Hellas gave him only the rough material, and the outer garment; she furnished him only with her language and with a number of phrases, but it is Israel that supplied him with the spirit which animates the whole.

In his endeavour not to display his true colours, he only mentioned such Biblical precepts, the expediency and utility of which can be easily understood, the משפטים, the מצות שכליות. He excludes the חקים, the מצות שמעיות, commandments of obedience, ritualistic commandments. That he mentions offerings, which are certainly ritualistic, is accounted

[1] Ch. iii., end of verse 10 and beginning of verse 11.

for by the fact that the idea of sacrifices was not foreign to the Greek mind. Such precepts as have an exclusively national importance are also omitted. Not even the Sabbath is mentioned.

Our author bears in this respect a close resemblance to Pseudo-Phocylides, whose work must be named here, although it is not of a Sibylline character. For the compiler of our collection, when he was tinkering together the most heterogeneous elements, thought good to insert in the undoubtedly Christian second Book ninety-three verses from the Pseudo-Phocylidean poem.

This false Phocylides was in reality a Jew, the question about whom has been finally settled by the late Jacob Bernays.[1] But in one point our author stands high above Pseudo-Phocylides; for the latter never openly and candidly condemns idolatry. In his endeavours to be taken for the ancient Phocylides, he is satisfied with keeping his aphorisms free from polytheistic colouring. Our Sibyllist, on the contrary, fearlessly and vigorously denounces idolatry in all its phases.

That he chose to promulgate his thoughts and feelings under the disguise of a Sibyl, must be accounted for by the times and the surroundings of the author. The two centuries after Ptolemæus Philadelphus were most fertile in the production of apocryphal books. But the growth of fictitious books was by no means confined to that period. When Bernays says that the profession of fabricating spurious books commenced with the attempts of Onomacritus, in the time of Pisistratus, and lasted till late in the Middle Ages, this is only to be understood of such books as were written in Greek. Generally speaking, however, what Bentley said is true, that the making of spurious books is almost as old as letters. But the period mentioned before was particularly prolific in that branch of workmanship. The rivalry and competition between the courts of Alexandria and Pergamus in enriching their libraries certainly gave a great impetus to that kind of activity, which was industriously pursued by people of all creeds. But it would be a mistake to apply the same hard and fast rule to all works of that kind, and to hold, for instance, Ovid guilty of fraud for his epistles of heroes and heroines, equally with downright forgers.

The Jews of Alexandria also occupied themselves to a great extent with that kind of work. We must, therefore, not be

[1] Some of his opinions have been opposed, but not with sufficient arguments.

surprised, however sad it may be, that there were Christian scholars who put the whole stigma attached to such fraudulent authorship upon the Jews. Valckenaer, in his learned essay on the Jew Aristobulus, shows that this teacher of Ptolemæus was a great culprit in that line. But he lays more to his charge than he really committed; and, says Valckenaer, he was so glad to find that a Jew, and not a Christian, was the author of those forgeries; for, although his was a pious fraud, yet he much rather sees a lying Jew to be the cheat than a Christian. That he himself in his essay has to speak of religious forgeries committed by Christians is of no account, as it seems. Even the great Böckh, so well known also for his humanity, in one of his earlier writings[1] speaks, in connection with some verses falsely ascribed to the tragic poet, of the rather impious than pious fraud, which is ingrained in the nature of the Jews. And, curiously enough, a few lines before this tirade, on the very same page, he mentions the fictitious drama Clytemnestra, as written by a monk, and a few pages after, a Christian interpolation in an alleged letter of Plato.

Now one should think that no work is more calculated to dispel such bias than the books of the Sibylline Oracles. The greater part of them was written by Christians, with the deliberate purpose of propagating Christianity by these means. We find that Alexandre endeavours to defend their authors, and that he finds the deception venial, because it was the literary fashion in those days for authors to pass their works off under some old celebrated name; and that the writers of the Sibylline poems never had any direct intention of fraud, but used this form only as the most convenient one for circulating their views among the heathens. One would suppose that Alexandre would mete out equal justice to the Jewish Sibyllists. But no! He gladly seizes an opportunity (p. 352) of falling foul of the Jews generally in a terrible onslaught on the author of the fifth book. That man is to him, if not a Jew, certainly of Jewish extraction, because he displays the true nature of a Jew, in his blindly sticking to the Old Testament; in his unconquered faithfulness to his country and his religion, which is rather fanatical attachment than sincere piety. He shows nothing of that sanctity which pervades the other books. *He* cannot have the advantage of the excuse of pious fraud. He either wrote from hatred to the Romans, or in order to

[1] *Græcæ Tragœdiæ principum . . . num ea quæ supersunt genuina omnia sint*, etc. Heidelberg, 1808, p. 146.

get money from Jews and Judaizing Christians for his praises of the Jews and his merciless invective against the Romans. I fear the fate of Balaam overtook the learned Alexandre when he was writing these words. Even whilst writing, his intended condemnation, against his will, turned for the most part into a warm eulogy. It is worth noticing how blind fanaticism and mercenary motives, two very incongruous incentives indeed, are described here as acting on the same persons at the same time.

Quite a new theory was started by Frankel. He sees in the Jewish Oracles, and in some other supposititious books written by Jews, an Alexandrian Hagada, which was totally different from the Hagada of Palestine. These poems were, according to Frankel, never intended for heathen, but exclusively for Jewish readers. This theory is, in my opinion, untenable. The rigorous exclusion of all ritualistic and all specially national Biblical precepts from these poems, shows clearly that they at least were intended to be read by non-Jews. Their authors, inspired by their faith in the glorious future of Israel, imbued with its sublime teachings, but tinged at the same time with the philosophical ideas of their age, and struck with the grandeur and beauty of the literature of Hellas, wished to bring these various elements into harmony, and to place the results before the eyes of the Gentiles with the most fascinating art at their command. They found that the system of writing books under borrowed names was almost openly practised, and they lacked the moral power of rising above the spirit of their age and their surroundings. They are certainly neither more nor less guilty than a host of other writers of their own time and of subsequent ages; but however venial their mode of proceeding may be, it can never be fully justified before the forum of truth and religion. Ewald holds that the use of the Sibyl was a poetical license, similar to the invocation of the Muses by a modern poet, with this difference, that a poet calling on the Muses, may relate that which they inspire him with in their name; but that a Sibyl, according to the accepted usage, was always to speak of herself. Granted even this most lenient view of the matter, it ill accords with that veneration of the Holy Scriptures which we should expect from a Jewish scholar of those days, for him to assume, under whatever pretext, the title of a prophet, and to pass off his composition as the word of God revealed to him. However much we may try to excuse these Jewish Sibyllists, it cannot be denied that they have cast a slur on the fair fame of the Jewish sages.

The learned Fabricius[1] is of opinion that none of the oracles were composed by Jews, that all of them were written by Christians. And what are the arguments he bases his opinion on? Let us hear his words. "Jews," he said, "never used to spread false prophecies among the heathens, but were in this respect most religiously careful; and while they were possessed of the true and Divine prophets at home, they were solicitous neither to add anything to them nor to take anything from them. There is scarce any mention made of, and never any value put upon the Sibylline books by the Jews. Josephus does, indeed, by the way, mention them, but that only once; Philo not once. Nor, that I can possibly learn, have the Talmudic writers any regard for them. We never read that the heathens brought against the Jews the charge that they forged or interpolated the Sibylline verses, though we do read such an accusation against Christians." I wish I were able to conclude my essay with these words of Fabricius, who, in his estimation of the Jewish sages of old, is, on the whole, so correct. But I cannot do this. Confronted by the practices of these Egyptian Sibyllists I am obliged to gainsay Fabricius, and that it should be so is a circumstance which I cannot but call highly deplorable.

S. A. HIRSCH.

[1] *Bibliotheca Graeca*, I. 1, 133.